MINUTES FROM MCC IPT #1

Date: 20 July 2005

Location: Partnership 2 Bldg, Orlando, FL

Attendees: See attached list.

1. Tom Alley (PEO STRI) stated the purpose of this IPT is to have a two way dialog between Government and Industry. The slides that are to be presented are not detailed but are items that PEOSTRI believes may be problem areas. This is an opportunity to discuss concerns and issues from Contractors and Government personnel. Rich Olson was introduced as a Government consultant helping us resolve these issues. The main rule is that this is an IPT and everyone is encouraged to discuss matters they believe to be important.

2. Bob Wolfinger (PEO STRI) welcomed the group to PEO STRI and stated that the MCC Standard is the most successful standard PMTRADE has delivered. PEO STRI wants to keep the document relevant and accurate and hopes to add information into it to resolve interoperability issues. This standard is used by the Army to embed MILES into their product. As PEO STRI evolves to OneTESS we are hoping to use this document as a guide. .

3. Tom Alley (PEO STRI) stated that he expects us to probably have sidebars (committees) to study and make recommendations. The frequency of future meetings is undecided.

4. Issues raised from Contractors:

    a. There are missing issues and mistakes in current document.

    b. Clarification of MCC97

    c. Michael Malmberg (Saab) wants a better understanding of the different generations of MILES.

    d. How attached are we to the legacy items and are we going to get away from them. Document Path Forward.

    e. George Burmester (PEO STRI) sees MILES as evolving into the future OneTESS LT Standard. OneTESS Transition.

5. Bobbi Parrish (PEO STRI) stated that there is an MCC Standard website "http://www.peostri.army.mil/PRODUCTS/MCC/home.jsp" where relevant information can be found. The website includes past standards, the latest standard, approved ECPs, open ECPs, and blank ECP forms from which modifications, clarifications etc can be requested. She can be reached by clicking on the "Lead Engineer" and sending an email. One open ECP is to clarify MILES Code 35 PIDs. To do this she needs to have help from vendors who are using certain PIDs. The information needed is: more description of use of the PID, and on which MILES equipment are these PIDs being used. The P_k tables have been taken off of the web but can be obtained by contacting PEO STRI.

6. Joe Labalbo (PEO STRI) stated that P_k tables are going to still provided by PEO STRI but they need to be requested. The P_k lethality fidelity is an illusion in the battlefield. He

would like to use a default table in matrix form and **implement a P_k controlled effectiveness test**. We would still use ammo factors. It was agreed that this subject requires a **separate Committee**. Committee #1, chaired by Joe Labalbo. This Committee shall be combined with Committee #5, as discussed later.

    a. Rodney Drakeford (FORSCOM) stated that the Pk tables are not what they seem to be. He agreed that we need to have a sidebar to discuss the P_k issue. The committee needs to include NSC.

    b. George Burmester (PEO STRI) volunteered LTC Smith and himself to be the NSC representatives.

    c. Danny Adkins (ATSC) stated that the soldiers do take issue about not seeing the effects that they expected when they shoot. He gave a short history of the P_k tables. There is a working group at National Simulation Center (NSC) looking into the issue. Not getting the proper effects because of dust, rain, fog, etc or variability of transmitters and detectors, etc causes problems. There is a problem with using classified P_k tables.

    d. Joe Baldauf (PEO STRI) stated that if we are able to use default tables, it would simplify the Information Assurance (IA) approval process.

7. Tom Alley (PEO STRI) discussed having a System Design Guide to help develop MILES equipment. The name should probably be "MILES Performance Requirements" instead of Design Guide.

    a. Burmester (PEO STRI) stated that the design guide should have an LT2 representative so it looks to the future. IT should be consistent with the strategy toward OneTESS.

    b. Rich Keller (PEO STRI) stated that **casualty assessment methodology** and **required data** should be discussed.

    c. Frank Remond (DCA) stated that it might be better to make a larger LT document with MCC as a chapter in it.

    d. It was requested that MILES **external interfaces** and **wireless interfaces** requirements be defined (existing MILES equipment).

    e. Have it include interoperability issues.

    f. Joe Baldauf (PEO STRI) stated that we might want to add **Life Cycle Management** requirements.

8. Mark Poplin (PEO STRI) discussed existing inductive loops being used in the AT4 and MILES 2000 vest and where PEO STRI is developing a working group to navigate toward RF.

    a. Danny Adkins (ATSC) stated that it has been noted that going from using Infrared (IR) to Radio Frequencies (RF) decreases battery life dramatically. .

9. Jose Rodriguez (PEO STRI) discussed AARs. It is necessary to **Format Event data standardized**. It was agreed that this subject requires a **separate committee**. Committee #2, chaired by Rich Lawson.

   a. Should there be a common AAR.

   b. What level of commonality. (Physical layer defined, data elements and message format). Memory stick, standardized media, data.

   c. Joe Labalbo (PEO STRI) stated that an universal download device procurement is being considered.

   d. The actual physical download is important. Future force is embedding the AAR capability so it would help with their transitioning to have a **common denominator (subset)** (output media and data format)

   e. **Send out a User survey asking what they would use an AAR for if we provided it and the timeframe that is required to download available.** (1. At what point does the information become useful, and 2. If the information is important, how long does it take). **Unit Readiness Requirements**

   f. ATSC/TRADOC decides what elements are necessary.

   g. **Different units/commanders have different requirements/form. Position Log and Trace Creation Capability.**

10. John Cobb (PEO STRI) discussed environmental standards.

    a. It was stated that PEOSTRI should want to add ergonomics for torsos, airworthiness, explosive environments, altitude tests, and depth below water surface tests, as well as design restrictions (interface with soldier-equipment).

    b. It was discussed that the battery life requirement should be for the real usage (profile for temperature, etc).

11. Rich Olson stated that MILES systems are made by a variety of manufacturers which allows for detectors to not work with another manufacturer's transmitter. The problem is that specification requirements can be met by changing detectors or transmitters parameters, thus the parameters need to be standardized. There is a need for a **Common System Acceptance Test** and that the new systems need to be **backward compatibility with fielded systems.** It was agreed that this subject requires a **separate committee**. Committee #3, chaired by Bobbi Parrish, with Rich Olson.

    a. It was noted that there would need to be two thresholds. The two different thresholds would be for new and old equipment as the aging of lasers have to be taken into account.

    b. It needs to be taken into account that there are embedded systems and other laser detection systems that need to be thought about when making these decisions such as the new Apache systems.

12. Jose Rodriguez (PEO STRI) discussed making a common determination of all the firing and engagement indications. So that there is a fair fight. If there is a difference in the

equipment, there is an advantage/disadvantage for the soldiers. Compliancy testing? Firing and engagement need to have standardized **Visual/Audio cues and signatures AND voice effects.**

13. Scott Meshell (Raytheon) raised a question on Inductive loops. He wanted to know if the inductive loops are going to be standardized so that new MILES equipment can use older equipment as it currently is not able to do this. For example, to use the MILES 2000 AT4 SATs, the MILES 2000 vest must be used, this means that a MILES 2000 AT4 SATs can not be used with legacy vests.

    a. It was stated that once new equipment is received, the older equipment is considered obsolete and they are not expected to work together.

14. Jose Rodriguez (PEO STRI) discussed **external interfaces**. The external interfaces need to be described on past MILES equipment (**NLOS/Other Backhaul of Comm(s) processing of data/voice)** and the requirements for new equipment being purchased needs to be described (**Adding Interfacing Radios (IHITS, OIS, etc)).** It was agreed that this subject requires a **separate Committee**. Committee #3, chaired by Jose Rodriguez.

15. Mario Rodriguez (PEO STRI) discussed PIDS, ammo types, Self Kills, and Pairing. The first 4 ammo types were never used much let alone trying to use 8 ammo types. It might be better to use the last four ammo types as an extension to make more PIDS. Thus, the **use of ammo factors to increase PIDs** should be analyzed. Before PIDs or ammo types are modified in the standard, the cost to update CTC IS and other devices would have to be reviewed, thus this needs to be **coordinated with the CTC's**. The self kill requirement is not specified (standardized) thus, the different systems may or may not be killed by the same shot. Pairing is not defined thus is not being implemented the same. **Use of follow on near miss codes to determine a valid initial pairing** may be a method to resolve the standardization. The different systems may or may not be killed by the same shot depending on how it assesses a poorly received MILES code. **For a Vehicle Kill, which Ammo factor to use** should be defined. It was agreed that this subject requires a **separate Committee**. Committee #5, chaired by Mario Rodriguez. This committee shall be combined with Group #1.

    a. Other Issues that were raised.

        i. Frequency of meetings

            1. Committee meetings between IPTs.

            2. Results of committees and open discussion topics will fuel follow-on IPTS.

        ii. Medical casualty

        iii. Shot precision

        iv. **(Eye) Safety needs to be reconsidered if changing optical coding**

            1. **Enhanced Data vs RF output**

            2. **Include OneTESS**

     v. MOUT specific elements

          1. Negative reinforcements, range

     vi. Physical placement of detectors (more information for man like vehicle).

          1. Perspective of Future Force

          2. Wireless Detectors

          3. Coordination with future systems

     vii. Non-lethal weapons

          Include CCMCK

Action Items:

1. Minutes will be distributed and put on both the internal PEO STRI sharepoint and on the MCC website.

2. Would OneTESS use optical (laser) to pass player location data?

20 July 2005

Committees from MCC IPT #1

1. **Pk Tables (develop a path forward – Include NSC)**   CHAIR: J. Labalbo
   Player ID/Ammo Codes, Self Kills, Pairing analysis   CHAIR: M. Rodriguez

Name	Company		Name	Company
Brian Domian	TMI		Ed Kaprocki	UNITECH
Matt Draper	SAAB		Zelpha Hashem	LMIS
Frank Remond	CUBIC		Rodney Drakeford	FORSCOM
Danny Adkins	ATSC		Angela Yager	OSI-DS
Lou Ford	ICON		Bobbi Parrish	PEOSTRI

2. **AAR (**create user community survey)   CHAIR: R. Lawson

Name	Company		Name	Company
Rodney Drakeford	FORSCOM		Ed Kaprocki	UNITECH
Rich Keller	PEOSTRI		Micael Malmberg	SAAB
Jim Kissinger			Wanda Fuentes	PEOSTRI
Joe Baldauf	PEOSTRI		Bobbi Parrish	PEOSTRI
Dave Horrigan	PEOSTRI			

3. **Study Detector/transmitted for commonality of performance and Commonality (backward/downward) with fielded systems.**   CHAIR: B. Parrish/R. Olson

Name	Company		Name	Company
Joe Baldauf	PEOSTRI		Steve Preston	UNITECH
Matt Draper	SAAB		Micael Malmberg	SAAB
Zelpha Hashem	LMIS		Jim Finlayson	CUBIC
Lou Ford	ICON		Angela Yager	OSI-DS
Giles Jones	RAYTHEON		Dave Horrigan	PEOSTRI

4. **Standard set of interfaces** (Come up with a list of systems)   CHAIR: J. Rodriguez

Name	Company		Name	Company
Rodney Drakeford	FORSCOM		Steve Preston	UNITECH
Matt Draper	SAAB		Micael Malmberg	SAAB
Zelpha Hashem	LMIS		Jim Finlayson	CUBIC
Tom Newton	PEO STRI		Brian Domain	TMI
Rich Keller	PEOSTRI		Bobbi Parrish	PEOSTRI
Joe Baldauf	PEOSTRI		Dave Horrigan	PEOSTRI